REMARKS

Claims Objections

The Examiner has objected to claims 1 and 6-9 because of the following informalities: in-consistent term, i.e., "non-organic first barrier layer" versus "first barrier layer" (Emphasis added). The claims 1 and 6-9 have been amended to overcome the objection. The Applicant respectfully submits that these claims are now in condition for allowance.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103

The Examiner has rejected claims 13 and 15-30 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Andideh et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,448,185) in view of Lamey et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,045,870). The Applicant respectfully traverses. The claims 13, and 15 – 21 are not taught or rendered obvious by the cited references, either individually or in combination, and claims 22-30 have been cancelled. In particular, the cited references do not teach the element of independent claim 13 of "forming either of the via or the trench through the second barrier layer; and forming either of the via or the trench through the first barrier layer with an etch different from that used for forming either of the via or the trench through the second barrier layer". In contrast, Andideh teaches forming a via 107 through a dielectric layer 103 formed above a single barrier layer 102, the via 107 stopping on the barrier layer 102 and Lamey teaches etching through the two barrier layers 21 and 23 at the same time. Therefore, the Applicant respectfully submits that the independent claim 13 and the claims 15-21 that depend upon and incorporate the elements of claim 13 are not obvious in light of Andideh in view of Lamey.

Application No. 10/040,224 Preliminary Amendment dated December 19, 2003 Reply to Office Action of September 29, 2003

If there are any additional charges, please charge Deposit Account No. 02-2666.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN

Date: 12/19 , 2003

Heather M. Molleur Reg. No. 50,432

12400 Wilshire Boulevard Seventh Floor Los Angeles, CA 90025-1026 (408) 720-8300